



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/752,491	01/08/2004	Siddharth Navinchandra Ashar	839-1357	5611
30024	7590	03/19/2007	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C. 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			AFZALI, SARANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3726	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

ED

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/752,491	ASHAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sarang Afzali	3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,7,9,10 and 12-17 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 7,9,10 and 12-16 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12/14/2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The applicant's amendment filed on 12/14/2006 has been fully considered and made of record.
2. Claims 7, 9, 10, and 12-16 are allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshihiro et al. (JP 58163246 A).

As applied to claim 1, Yoshihiro et al. teach a method of axially removing a generator rotor (4, Fig. 2) from a generator housing wherein the generator (1, Fig. 2) is disposed axially between gas and steam turbines (2 & 3, Fig. 2), comprising the steps of: (a) releasing the generator (1) from a foundation supporting the generator (shown in Fig. 2 but not labeled); (b) rotating (by turning device 5, Fig. 5) the generator about a vertical axis and along guides (top plates of turning devices 5 are considered guides for holding and guiding the generator in the rotational movement) to displace at least one end of the generator from axial alignment with one of said turbines to enable removal of

the rotor from the casing without interference from said one of the turbines (Fig. 3, Constitution, lines 1-6).

Note that Yoshihiro et al. teach the steps wherein the foundation (6) includes a block (the two blocks at the bottom on the front side of the generator 1 in contact with foundation 6, Figs. 1-2) and including removing the block from the foundation (shown in hidden line in elevated position, Fig. 2) leaving an open recess through the foundation and rotating the generator about a vertical axis through the recess in the foundation.

Also note that as the generator including the blocks are elevated from the top of foundation, it leaves a recess/open space on top of the foundation in between the steam and gas turbine assemblies (Fig. 2).

As applied to claim 6, it is inherent that Yoshihiro et al. teach a step wherein subsequent to the step of rotational displacement of the generator out of axial alignment with the turbines to allow for the removal of the generator rotor, there is a step of rotational movement of the generator about the vertical axis in order to reassemble and displace the generator back into alignment with the steam and gas turbines and securing the generator to the generator foundation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihiro et al. Yoshihiro et al. teach the invention cited with the vertical axis of rotation overlapping the axial centerline but not offset an axial centerline of the generator allowing equal access to both ends of the generator. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to have located the turning device (5) in such a position to allow the vertical axis being offset from an axial centerline of the generator allowing more access to one end over the other end of the generator as needed.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 1214/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants amendment in regards to the drawings , abstract, and disclosure have been accepted and therefore, the objection to the drawings , abstract, and disclosure are withdrawn.

Under "Remarks/Arguments", page 2, paragraph 2, with respect to Yoshihiro reference, Applicant argues that "the Examiner has interpreted the disclosure in

Yoshihiro well beyond that which is shown in the drawings. For example, it is not at all clear that the foundation in Yoshihiro includes a block that is removed from the foundation so as to leave an open recess through one of the foundation sides" and that "there is no disclosure in Yoshihiro of any block located on one side of the generator and which is subsequently removed to open a recess through that side of the foundation. In fact, from the disclosure in Figure 3 of Yoshihiro, it does not appear that there are any blocks on the side of the generator that require removal in order for the generator to be pivoted about the vertical axis as also shown in Figure 3."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the above assertion and once again directs applicant to Figures 1, 2, and 4 of Yoshihiro wherein a block is located on either sides of the generator (1) and note that Yoshihiro (Fig. 2) indeed teaches the steps wherein the foundation (6) includes a block (the two blocks at the bottom on either sides of the generator 1 in contact with foundation 6) and including removing the block from the foundation (shown in hidden line in elevated position, Fig. 2) leaving an open recess through the foundation and rotating the generator about a vertical axis through the recess in the foundation.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarang Afzali whose telephone number is 571-272-8412. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-3:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on 571-272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Application/Control Number: 10/752,491
Art Unit: 3726

Page 7

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



SA

3/6/2007



DAVID P. BRYANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

